			-	The state of the s
Case 3:06-cv-	IN THE UNITED ST FOR THE NORTHE	TATES DISTRIC	T COURT OF TEXAS	US. DELICT COURT HERN DELICT COURT PAGEID 138 J. 6 2607 Lay
	DALLE	AS DIVISION		K, U.S. DISTRIC COURT
ROBERT DALE PI	EEK	§	By	Bagany
	Petitioner,	§		
VS.	,		No. 3-06-CV-	1970-M
NATHANIEL QUA	RTERMAN, Director	§		
Texas Department of		§ § §		
Correctional Institu	tions Division	§		
	Respondent.	§		
ORDER	OF THE COURT ON TH	<u>IE FOREGOING I</u>	<u>RECOMMENDA</u>	TION
Considering th Appellate Procedure 22	e record in this case and the 2(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2253 (c	e above recommend), the Court hereby	ation, and pursua finds and orders:	nt to Federal Rule of
IFP STATUS				
(X) the par	ty appealing is GRANTED a	<i>in forma pauperis</i> st	atus on appeal.	

the party appealing is proceeding in forma pauperis. () the party appealing is DENIED in forma pauperis status on appeal for the following reasons: () the Court certifies, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 24(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (a)(3), that the appeal is not taken in good faith. In support of this finding, the Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation entered in this case on November 2, 2006. Based upon the Magistrate Judge's findings, this Court finds that the appeal presents no legal points of arguable merit and is therefore frivolous. See Harkins v. Roberts, 935 F. Supp. 871, 873 (S. D. Miss. 1996) (citing Howard v. King, 707 F. 2d 215, 219-20 (5th Cir. 1983)). the person appealing is not a pauper; the person appealing has not complied with the requirements of Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and /or 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) as ordered by the Court. (See Notice of Deficiency and Order entered on _____ COA: () a Certificate of Appealability is GRANTED on the following issues: (X) a Certificate of Appealability is DENIED. The Court hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation filed in this case on April 16, 2007, in support of its finding that Petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. See Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 480-81, 120 S. Ct. 1595, 1602, 146 L.Ed.2d 542 (2000). , 2007.